



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,064	03/07/2006	Masanobu Honda	033082M257	9221

441 7590 09/26/2006  
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL  
1850 M STREET, N.W., SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

ANGADI, MAKI A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1765

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/538,064

Applicant(s)

HONDA ET AL.

Examiner

Maki A. Angadi

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3/7/2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/7/2006, 6/9/2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a method of plasma etching classified in class 216 subclass 58
- II. Claims 9-13 drawn to an apparatus for plasma etching classified in class 156 subclass 345.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus using laser ablation or removal.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Michael Makuch on 7/19/2006 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I

Art Unit: 1765

claims 1-8. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 9-13 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35

Art Unit: 1765

U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1 and 2, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nakaune (US Pub. 2003/0080091) in view of Hasegawa (US Patent No. 6,593,246) and Ono, Pure and Applied Chemistry, Vol.66, No.6, (1994).

*As to claims 1*, Nakaune discloses a method and an apparatus that reads on plasma etching an organic material (paragraph 0004) by means of a parallel plate type plasma etching apparatus (Fig.1) (paragraph 0013); wherein the organic material films is plasma-etched (paragraph 0004 0006) with; a high frequency power of a frequency in the range of 300MHz to 1GHz (paragraph 0014); and a process gas including an accelerating gas that is ionized with an ionization energy of about 0.025 eV to 1eV (paragraph 0014) and a molecular gas (paragraph 0020).

Nakaune does not expressly cite the use of an inorganic material film as a mask. However, Hasegawa discloses the plasma etching of an organic material film formed on a substrate with an inorganic material film used as mask (col.4, lines 65-67 and col.9, lines 4-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an inorganic material film as a mask in the process used by Nakaune because Hasegawa illustrates that by using inorganic film as a mask one can minimize

damage to the low dielectric constant organic film in the step of removing the resist (col.2, lines 64-67).

Nakaune fails to disclose the ionization cross section of the accelerating process gas. However, Ono discloses the ionization cross section of the process gas molecules in the range  $2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^2$  to about  $10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2$  for  $\text{Cl}_2$  in the plasma etching process (Fig.4, page 1331). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select ionization cross section of molecular gas in the plasma etching process used by Nakune because Ono illustrates that ionization cross section of molecular gas in the etching plasma determine the etching characteristics such as etch rate, ion and electron energies and plasma densities (page 1327, second paragraph).

*As to claim 2*, Nakaune discloses a plasma etching apparatus that includes a process vessel into the which the process gas is supplied (paragraph 0013 and 0020); and parallel plate electrodes disposed in the process vessel (paragraph 0022), the electrodes being constituted by a support electrode that is opposed to the support electrode, and a counter electrode that is opposed to the support electrode (paragraphs 0020 and 0022); and the high frequency power for generating the plasma is applied to the support electrode (paragraph 0020).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nakune (US Pub. 2003/0080091) in view of Hasegawa (US Patent No. 6,593,246) and Ono, Pure

and Applied Chemistry, Vol.66, No.6, (1994) as applied to claim 1 and 2, in further view of Ohmi (US Patent No. 5,272,417).

*As to claim 3*, Nakaune discloses the use of high frequency power in the range of 300 MHz to 1 GHz, but fails to disclose using self-bias voltage of the support electrode. However, Ohmi discloses the use of self-bias of the electrode of about 400 V (col.3, lines 3-9), which is lower than 500 V used by the applicant. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select self-bias voltage for the electrode used by Nakaune because Ohmi illustrates that applying self-bias voltage to the electrode leads acceleration of ions by the potential based on the difference between the self bias voltage and the plasma potential (col.1, lines 42-50).

*As to claim 4*, see the arguments with respects to claims 2 and 3.

*As to claim 5*, Nakaune discloses the molecular gas N<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub> but fails to disclose the process gas argon as the ionization accelerating gas. However, Ohmi discloses using argon as the ionization accelerating gas (col.3, lines 11-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select argon as ionization gas in the etching process used by Nakaune because Ohmi illustrates that argon gas being an inert

gas one can generate plasma with high concentration and to increase the throughput (col.3, lines 30-33).

*As to claim 6*, Nakaune discloses the use of argon as a process gas but fails to disclose the use of ammonia as the molecular gas. However, Hasegawa discloses the use of ammonia as the molecular gas (col.9, lines 51-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select ammonia as molecular gas in the plasma etch process used by Nakaune because Hasegawa illustrates that the molecular gas such as ammonia is useful to etch low dielectric constant organic film (col.9, lines 53-55).

*As to claim 7*, Nakaune discloses a frequency of the high-frequency power for generating the plasma is in the range 300 MHz to about 1GHz (paragraph 0014) that is higher than the value cited by the applicant. The frequency of the plasma source is an experimental parameter, which is adjusted to meet the etching conditions and the plasma density. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select plasma frequency that is required for plasma etching of organic material. One who is skilled in the art would be motivated to optimize through routine experimentation of changing frequency values. See MPEP § 2144.05 II.



*As to claim 8*, Nakaune discloses the distance between the support electrode and the counter electrode in the parallel plate electrode is between 50 mm to 100 mm (paragraph 0019), which is lower than the range ( $<40\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ ) cited by the applicant. The distance between the parallel plate electrode is dependent on several parameters such as rate of etching, chamber geometry, pressure in the chamber and etching gases used in the process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the distance between electrodes to achieve the desired etch rate. One who is skilled in the art would be motivated to optimize distance between parallel plates through routine experimentation. See MPEP § 2144.05 II

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hayashi (US Pub.No. 2002/0042204) discloses plasma processing apparatus with reduced parasitic capacity and loss in RF power.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maki A. Angadi whose telephone number is 571-272-8213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 4.30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine G. Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1765

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dr. Maki Angadi  
Examiner,  
Art Unit 1765



**SHAMIM AHMED**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**